Exhibit F

```
1
    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2
    FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
3
    -----x
4
    SALLY W. TARQUINIO,
5
           -v- Plaintiff, : Civil Action No.:
6
    JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY : 1:23-CV-00727-RDB
7
    APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY, :
8
                Defendant.
9
    -----x
10
11
            Remote Videotaped Deposition of
12
                  MARK SIVIERI, M.D.
13
               Thursday, November 9, 2023
14
                    12:13 P.M. EST
15
16
17
18
19
20
    Job No.: 510184
21
    Pages: 1 - 45
22
    Reported by: Fazier Walle, Stenographic Reporter
```

			1
1	CONTENTS		
2	EXAMINATION OF MARK SIVIERI, M.D.	PAGE	
3	By Mr. Ross	7	
4			
5	EXHIBITS		
6	SIVIERI, M.D. DEPOSITION EXHIBIT	PAGE	
7	Ex. 1 Office Note, Ms. Dudley, 11/15/21	20	
8	Ex. 2 Report, LabCorp, 11/5/21	27	
9	Ex. 3 Emails, "Additional Information,"		
10	12/3-12/5/21	32	
11	Ex. 4 Notice of Deposition by Written		
12	Questions, 8/30/23	35	
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			

17 12:24:05 1 The appropriate answer to that question is Α. 12:24:07 2 of -- you know, I work with my PA, I supervise my 3 12:24:11 PA, my PA kind of hallway conversed with me about 12:24:17 4 the case, and then obviously I've read the case 5 12:24:20 notes four or five times due to multiple legal 12:24:23 6 situations and multiple, multiple subpoenas that 7 12:24:29 have been to my office. So obviously I got back 8 12:24:33 online and refresh my memory about what happened 12:24:36 9 when she came back to us recently. So that's the 12:24:38 10 extent of that. 12:24:39 11 Ο. So having reviewed those notes and read 12:24:41 12 the case documents, what do you understand her 13 condition to be that's central to this case? 12:24:43 12:24:45 14 That's a good question. The answer is I 12:24:50 15 have no idea. And there's nothing in the laboratory 16 testing that was done by my office that would give 12:24:54 17 her any diagnosis. So the answer is no, I do not 12:24:57 18 12:25:00 have any specific condition that she has at the 19 12:25:04 current time. 20 12:25:04 Q. Okay. Great. 21 12:25:10 Are you -- well, strike that. Let me back

22

up.

12:25:13

1	A. I do.	12:30:49
2	Q. Okay. It says "She submitted her old	12:30:49
3	medical records to her employer in order to get an	12:30:52
4	exemption from the COVID vaccine. She works at	12:30:54
5	[APL] as an engineer. They are requiring a letter	12:30:57
6	from a doctor attesting to the fact that her medical	12:31:00
7	issues are reason to exempt her from the	12:31:04
8	vaccination. Her reasoning is that any immune	12:31:07
9	system challenge (such as from a vaccine) will flare	12:31:07
10	up her chronic lyme." Do you see that?	12:31:07
11	A. Yep, I do.	12:31:15
12	Q. Do you do you know who wrote this?	12:31:15
13	A. Yes, Lynn Dudley wrote that.	12:31:17
14	Q. All right. If we scroll to the bottom of	12:31:22
15	page 1, it says "Treatment Plan." Do you see that?	12:31:26
16	A. Yes, I do.	12:31:29
17	Q. Fair to say Ms. Dudley wrote this as well?	12:31:30
18	A. Yes, she did.	12:31:33
19	Q. And the line under "Treatment Plan" reads	12:31:35
20	"Patient will have to have conclusive lab results	12:31:38
21	which show that she has [an] active infection in	12:31:40
22	order to qualify for exemption to COVID vaccine, and	12:31:42

	Conducted on November 9, 2025	
1	that would only be temporary." Do you see that?	12:31:50
2	A. Yes, I do.	12:31:52
3	Q. Did Ms. Dudley run this treatment plan by	12:31:54
4	you before documenting it?	12:31:58
5	A. Yes, she yes, she did. But I mean,	12:32:00
6	it's a little nuanced, that she might have written	12:32:03
7	it and then asked me and I said it was okay. But	12:32:07
8	yes, she ran it by me.	12:32:10
9	Q. Okay. So you agree with the with the	12:32:12
10	treatment plan?	12:32:14
11	A. A hundred percent, yes.	12:32:15
12	Q. Okay. So we're going to break apart this	12:32:19
13	sentence here.	12:32:23
14	It says "Patient will need to have	12:32:25
15	conclusive lab results whichshe has [an] active	12:32:28
16	infection in order to qualify for exemption to COVID	12:32:34
17	vaccine." So what does that what does that mean?	12:32:40
18	A. So an "active infection" would be defined	12:32:48
19	as having and what Lynn Dudley was accomplishing	12:32:51
20	and what we were accomplishing would be an	12:32:59
21	IgM-positive result for one of the tick-borne	12:33:01
22	diseases that were tested for on that day. That's	12:33:06

i	Conducted on November 9, 2023 26	ı
1	Q. And then the last the last part of that	12:34:41
2	sentence says "and that would only be temporary."	12:34:43
3	Do you see that?	12:34:46
4	A. Yes, I do.	12:34:47
5	Q. Okay. So can you can you explain to me	12:34:48
6	what that part of the sentence means?	12:34:50
7	A. It means that if someone were to have an	12:34:54
8	active infection with, I would say, any acute	12:35:01
9	illness, whether it would be a virus or a bacterial	12:35:06
10	illness, that it would seem reasonable to delay a	12:35:11
11	vaccine until the infection is cleared. So that	12:35:14
12	sentence is referring to the fact that even if	12:35:21
13	Ms. Tarquinio had a positive IgM Lyme or other	12:35:23
14	tick-borne disease, that if this office were to have	12:35:26
15	written in a vaccine exemption, there would be a	12:35:32
16	time limit on that exemption until the active	12:35:34
17	infection was resolved, which would usually be done	12:35:39
18	by repeat blood testing.	12:35:42
19	(Reporter clarification.)	12:35:54
20	A. Repeat repeat blood testing.	12:35:55
21	BY MR. ROSS:	12:35:56
22	Q. So did you ever advise Ms. Tarquinio not	12:35:56

		I
1	to get vaccinated from COVID?	12:36:04
2	A. No.	12:36:06
3	Q. To your knowledge, did Ms. Dudley ever	12:36:06
4	advise Ms. Tarquinio not to get vaccinated from	12:36:09
5	COVID?	12:36:11
6	A. Definitely not (low audio).	12:36:15
7	Q. Sorry. I didn't catch that.	12:36:16
8	A. Definitely not.	12:36:17
9	Q. Definitely not. Okay.	12:36:18
10	Is there anyone in your office other than	12:36:20
11	yourself and Ms. Dudley who could have advised	12:36:21
12	Ms. Tarquinio not to get vaccinated from COVID?	12:36:24
13	A. No.	12:36:28
14	MR. ROSS: Okay. Joe, can we put up	12:36:30
15	Exhibit 2, please?	
16	A/V TECHNICIAN: Yes. Please stand by.	12:36:38
17	(Exhibit 2 was marked for identification.)	12:36:38
18	(A/V technician screen-sharing.)	10:03:53
19	A/V TECHNICIAN: Now showing you Exhibit	12:36:38
20	No. 2.	12:36:53
21	BY MR. ROSS:	12:36:55
22	Q. Okay. We'll mark well, this has been	12:36:56
		ĺ

	Conducted on November 9, 2023 29	
1	for acute infection with tick-borne disease for	12:37:59
2	tick-borne diseases.	12:38:03
3	Q. Okay. And did this did the lab work	12:38:05
4		12:38:08
	show that Ms. Tarquinio had any positive infections	
5	for Lyme or tick-borne diseases?	12:38:12
6	A. No, she it did not.	12:38:16
7	Q. And did it show that she had tested	12:38:18
8	negative for Lyme or tick-borne diseases?	12:38:20
9	A. Yes.	12:38:26
10	Q. All right. So let's go through this	12:38:30
11	quickly, recalling that that nobody but you on	12:38:31
12	this on this screen here is a doctor, so bear	12:38:35
13	with us.	12:38:38
14	On page 1 at the bottom, it says "Lyme	12:38:39
15	Lyme Blot, Serum" sorry "Lyme Line Blot,	12:38:42
16	Serum." Do you see that?	12:38:48
17	A. Yes, I do.	12:38:54
18	Q. And between this and the top of the next	12:38:55
19	page, there's approximately ten alphanumeric	12:38:56
20	designations. Do you see those?	12:39:05
21	A. Yes, I do.	12:39:08
22	Q. And is it fair to say that they	12:39:12

PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

1	IgM is acute infection.	12:40:24
2	Q. So is it fair to same that the IgM is a	12:40:26
3	current snapshot in time?	12:40:29
4	A. Yes.	12:40:32
5	Q. And the IgG is looking backwards?	12:40:32
6	A. Yes.	12:40:35
7	Q. Okay. And so after "Lyme IgG," it says	12:40:36
8	"Negative"; is that correct?	12:40:39
9	A. Yes, it does.	12:40:41
10	Q. Meaning, at least according to these	12:40:43
11	tests, there's no indication that she's ever had	12:40:45
12	Lyme's disease; is that correct?	12:40:49
13	A. That is correct.	12:40:50
14	Q. And then further down the page, under	12:40:51
15	"Lyme IgM Line Blot Interp," it says "Negative"	12:40:52
16	again; is that correct?	12:40:59
17	A. That is correct.	12:41:03
18	Q. And that means that at the time this test	12:41:04
19	was taken, there was no indication of active Lyme	12:41:06
20	disease in her blood; is that correct?	12:41:06
21	A. That is correct.	12:41:08
22	Q. Do you know what date this blood work was	12:41:09

Tra Co

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

Transcript of Mark Sivieri, M.D. Conducted on November 9, 2023			
Conducted on Provenieur 9, 2025	$\dot{\exists}$		
function, which is basically one specific part of	1	2:43:55	
the immune system and how it fights and how it	1	2:44:00	
protects you.	1	2:44:04	
Q. So the sentence we just well, strike	1	2:44:11	
that. Let me back up.		2:44:14	
The lab results that we just looked at	1	2:44:16	
measure her CD57?		2:44:18	
A. Yes.	1	2:44:21	
Q. So Sally's email here says "My CD57 result	1	2:44:23	
is still considered an indication of chronic Lyme	1	2:44:28	
disease." Do you agree with her that the CD57 score 12:44:3			
she lists is an indication of chronic Lyme disease? 12:44:35			

12:44:42

12:44:45

12:44:49

12:44:53

12:44:56

12:45:01

12:45:06

12:45:10

12:45:15

12 she lists is an indication of chronic Lyme disease? 13 That is a complicated question, because of 14 the history of this testing and how long it's been 15 around. But I'll make the answer easy. And the 16 answer is I do not feel -- I think that the answer 17 to that is no. But like she wrote there, it is a 18 controversial comment to say that a low -- well, 19 what I'm saying is it's a controversial comment to 20 say that low CD57 means chronic Lyme. But let me 21 rephrase and say it definitely does not mean 22

12:45:24 active -- it does not guarantee in any way, shape,

1	or form an active infection.	12:45:28		
2	Q. So if a patient walked into your practice	12:45:31		
3	and handed you a CD57 score, is there any score that	12:45:33		
4	it could be that would allow you to look at that	12:45:38		
5	score and say, "This person has Lyme disease"?	12:45:41		
6	A. If someone walked into my office and only	12:45:47		
7	had a CD57 count and said, "I want you to help me,"	12:45:49		
8	I would check them for infections lyme disease	12:45:52		
9	might be one of those infections but I would not	12:46:01		
10	diagnose the patient on the spot with Lyme disease.	12:46:04		
11	Or I would never diagnose a patient with an			
12	infection on the spot with just a low CD57. There	12:46:10		
13	would be have to be collaborating evidence to	12:46:13		
14	show that there was active infection to diagnose	12:46:16		
15	that yes, to diagnose with an active infection.	12:46:19		
16	Q. Understood.	12:46:23		
17	MR. ROSS: Okay. Let's put up Exhibit 4,	12:46:26		
18	Joe.	12:46:29		
19	Q. And, Dr. Sivieri, I believe this is our	12:46:33		
20	last one.	12:46:36		
21	A/V TECHNICIAN: Please stand by.	12:46:39		
22	(Exhibit 4 was marked for identification.)	12:46:52		

1	of that deficit."	12:49:35
2	Q. Do you stand by that answer as we sit here	12:49:37
3	today?	12:49:40
4	A. Yes, I do.	12:49:40
5	MR. ROSS: Joe, I think we can put the	12:49:47
6	exhibits down.	12:49:48
7	(A/V technician complies.)	12:49:50
8	Q. Did you ever speak to anyone from	12:49:51
9	Ms. Tarquinio's employer regarding her request to be	12:49:54
10	excused from the vaccine requirement?	12:49:56
11	A. No, I did not.	12:49:58
12	Q. Were you ever asked to?	12:50:01
13	A. No, I was not.	12:50:06
14	Q. Are you allowed to speak with a patient's	12:50:07
15	employer without the patient's consent or	12:50:12
16	authorization?	12:50:14
17	A. I actually don't know, but I would say no.	12:50:18
18	(Simultaneous speakers.)	12:50:24
19	MR. DUMOFF: If I may, that's a legal	12:50:24
20	question, so I'm not sure about posing that to	12:50:26
21	Dr. Sivieri. Maybe you can rephrase it.	12:50:29
22		

Dr. Sivieri's Deposition Exhibit 1

Case 1:23-cv-00727-RDB Document Filed 01/11/24 Page 15 of 22

Note(s) Patient: TARQUINIO, SALLY DOB: 20-Jul-1959	Turning Point Integrative Health Center
 -	

Patient Name: SALLY TARQUINIO

DOB: 20-Jul-1959

Address: 524 SALTWORKS CT

ANNAPOLIS, MD, 21401

Mobile: (410) 258-4022 (approved for messages)

Email: STARQUIN@ COMCAST.NET (approved for messages)

Last Visit Date:

Provider in attendance: Lynn Dudley

Chief Complaint

Initial consultation - Old patient

History of Present Illness

Patient is a 62 year-old female who has a history of lyme disease in 2004 and then again in 2012. Also has issues with mold, electrohypersensitivity, heavy metal issues. Did Klinghardt protocol and was also seeing Dr. Schwartz.

She submitted her old medical records to her employer in order to get an exemption from the COVID vaccine. She works at Applied Physics Lahs as an engineer. They are requiring a letter from a doctor attesting to the fact that her medical issues are reason to exempt her from the vaccination. Her reasoning is that any immune system challenge (such as from a vaccine) will flare up her chronic lyme disease.

ROS:

energy good sleep - usually good GI - bloating after meals cold hands and feet mildly achy joints

PMHX:

chronic lyme

RX:

pone

OTC:

see patient history paperwork

Diet:

mostly paleo

Habits:

coffee in the morning exercise - once a week

Treatment Plan

- Patient will need to have conclusive lab results which show that she has active infection in order to qualify for exemption to COVID vaccine, and that would only be temporary



Case 1:23-cv-00727-RDB Document - Filed 01/11/24 Page 16 of 22

e(s) ient: TARQUINIO, SALLY 8: 20-Jul-1959	Turning Point Integrative Health Center
	<u></u>

- she will get labs done today and we will follow-up through phone call next week

Next Appointment

Date:

Time:

Follow-Up Appointment Request

Lynn M Dudley BAC

n/a

Date and Time of Dictation: 15-Nov-2021, 10:32AM

Provider Signature

Lynn Dudley 10005 Old Columbia Rd, Suite P170, Columbia, MD, 21046 301-367-0358

Printed: 15-Nov-21 / 10:32 AM - Patient Confidential

Dr. Sivieri's Deposition Exhibit 4

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

SALLY W. TARQUINIO

Plaintiff

v.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY APPLIED PHYSICS LAB

Defendants

CIVIL ACTION NO: 1:23-cv-00727-RDB

PLAINTIFF'S RULE 31 NOTICE OF DEPOSITION BY WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 31(a)(1) Plaintiff, by her undersigned attorney, propounds the below questions, to be answered under oath, upon:

Dr. Mark Sivieri Turning Point Integrative Health Center 185 Harry S Truman, Ste 108 Annapolis, Maryland 21401 443-951-4300

QUESTION NO. 1: Are you a licensed physician/doctor able to practice medicine in Maryland?

ANSWER:

see wind downest



QUESTION NO. 2: Was Plaintiff Sally W. Tarquinio your patient in or around July and August 2012?

ANSWER: SER WOW DO WHEAT

QUESTION NO. 3: Is the document identified as "Plaintiff 053" and dated 7/3/2012 a document that you authored and/or signed?

ANSWER: SEO WULD DOLUMENT

QUESTION NO. 4: Are the documents identified as "JHU00005" thru "JHU00014" and attached hereto the record/results of Ms. Tarquinio's lab work that you or your office ordered on or about June 30, 2012?

ANSWER: SEE WURD DOUNENT

QUESTION NO. 5: Did the results of this lab work cause you to write the above correspondence (Plaintiff 053) indicating that Sally Tarquinio's "CD57 count was low..." and that this was an indicator that her "immune system has been challenged and is not functioning optimally towards chronic infections?"

ANSWER: SER WORD DOURDST

QUESTION NO. 6: Can a challenged immune system as described above be a symptom or indicator – whether conclusive or not – of "immune dysregulation" or some type of immune disorder, whether permanent or temporary?

ANSWER: SER WORD DOWNEY		
QUESTION NO. 7: Did Sally Tarquinio visit you or your office in or around November, 2021?		
ANSWER: SEE WORD DOUNGH		
QUESTION NO. 8: Are the documents identified as Sivieri 0004 thru Sivieri 0022 a true and ac-		
curate record of her visit(s) and/or lab work ordered by you, your practice, or physician's assis-		
tant?		
ANSWER: See WORD DOUM!		
QUESTION NO. 9: Did the results of the lab work ordered in November, 2021, reflect Tar-		
quinio's CD57 count and, if yes, was it higher, lower, or the same as it was in July 2012?		
ANSWER: SER WORD DO(UGN)		
QUESTION NO. 10: Did these results from November, 2021, indicate that Sally Tarquinio's im-		
mune system was challenged in some way or to some degree on the date that her lab specimens		
(blood or other samples) were collected?		
ANSWER: SEE WOID DOUVENT		
I SWEAR AND AFFIRM UNDER THE PENALTIES OF PERJURY THAT THE ABOVE AN-		
SWERS TO DEPOSITION QUESTION ARE TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY		

ABILITIES, RECOLLECTION, AND BELIEF.

Case 1:23-cv-00727-RDB Document 25-7 Filed 01/11/24 Page 21 of 22

Signed:	Mohlen	<i>8130123</i>
Mark Sivieri, M	(J.D.	Date

Case 1:23-cv-00727-RDB Document 25-7 Filed 01/11/24 Page 22 of 22

10005 Old Columbia Road P170 Columbia, MD 21046



185 Harry S. Truman Pkwy #108 Annapolis, MD 21401

Mark Sivieri, M.D. Lynn Dudley, PA-C. Chiso Uko, PA-C. Danielle Cheplowitz, NP.

8/30/2023

Here are the answers to the questions posed:

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. A low CD-57 could be part of a larger finding of immune dysregulation but, by itself, does not rise to the level of demonstrating this when used alone.
- 7. She visited my office but saw my physician assistant
- 8. Yes
- 9. It was higher (improved) which indicates that this one specific portion of her immune system had improved from the last time that it was checked by my office.
- 10. Some authors have suggested that CD-57 is an indicator of Lyme disease but that view is highly controversial. This is a marker whose clinical significance varies widely and can only be interpreted as part of a more comprehensive lab evaluation and clinical picture. To say that it suggests there is an immune deficit is technically accurate but does not provide enough information to allow a conclusion about the clinical significance of that deficit.

Me